Examiner's Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiners for the telephone interview granted to their Attorney on June 21, 2006. In the Interview, Applicants' Attorney tried to explain the present invention and how the claims of the present invention were unobvious, and thus, patentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the combination of Reed et al. (US6,044,205)in view of Li (US6,725,227). The Examiners indicated that the interview had clarified the claimed invention. The parties agreed that Applicants would submit a Response to the initial Office Action setting forth their position, and that Examiners would consider such Response in light of the Interview discussions.

Claims 1-7 are Not Directed to Non-statutory Subject Matter and therefore are proper subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101

The rejection of claims 1-7 as directed to nonstatutory subject matter is respectfully traversed. rejection is not understood. The bookmarking of Web documents at receiving display stations involves tangible apparatus at a receiving display station connected to the This bookmarking is described as carried out by a Web browser modified so as to provide a tangible display interface format alternate to a standard display format. These alternate formats stored in respective folders so that they may be used as interfaces for the designated bookmarked documents represent tangible results. All of the elements described are conventional data processing expedients, combinations of which expedients have been the subject of thousands of patents.

If the Examiner still believes that there is nonstatutory subject matter, he is respectfully requested to

specifically point out the specific elements or the combinations in the claims which are non-statutory.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Reed et al. in view of Li is Respectfully Traversed.

Although each of the two combined references relate to bookmarking of documents accessed from the World Wide Web, the references either individually or in combination fail to suggest either the problem which the present invention addresses or the novel claimed solution to such problem.

Bookmarked Web documents are presented to the receiving user in a standard all-purpose display interface that serves as a default interface. The user may need to present different types of regularly accessed, i.e. bookmarked. Web documents in different formats. For example, the user may wish to view a newspaper Web page in a different format from his stock portfolio page or job related technical Web page. Consequently, there is a need to provide Web page users with the means for effectively displaying bookmarked Web documents in different display interface formats.

The present invention provides the user at a receiving web station with several alternate Web page display interface formats from which the user may select the appropriate format for each Web document that he bookmarks. Thus, each time that a bookmarked Web document will be subsequently displayed, it will have this optimum presentation interface format. The invention uses the combination of means for bookmarking a received Web document, means for predetermining at least one display interface format alternate to said standard display interface format for bookmarked Web documents, means for providing a document folder associated with each alternate

display interface format, means for enabling a user to put a bookmarked Web document into a document folder associated with an alternate display interface format and means for displaying bookmarked documents in said document folder in said alternate display interface format.

The Reed patent is a general teaching of a wide variety of implementations for transferring data over communication networks such as the Web. It does include bookmarked Web document transmittal. Reed also discloses that objects which we may assume could be Web.pages are stored in folders. However, beyond this point, there appears to be nothing in Reed of additional pertinence to the present invention. Applicants have reviewed the sections cited by Examiner: col. 2, 11. 55-58, and col. 18, 11. 1-6 as well as the whole reference and can not find any suggestion of the following elements of the present invention. Reed does not disclose any predetermined display interface format which is alternate to a standard or default interface format used in the receiving Web station display. Reed does not disclose enabling a user to store a bookmarked document in a document folder for a selected alternate display format so that when the bookmarked document is received it will be displayed in the alternate display folder rather than being displayed in the standard format in the case where the received bookmarking were not in the alternate display interface format.

The Li patent does not make up for the above mentioned deficiencies of the Reed patent. The Li patent is a very extensive patent dealing with many aspects of "advanced" Web bookmarks. However, in the L1 specification, there appears to be no mention of any need to present received Web documents in alternative interface formats suitable to the user's needs. At column 18, lines 22-25 i.e. claim 24 of Li

P.8

PATENT 10/660,072

cited by Examiner that there is described a generator for providing information in response to a search query in a predetermined format. At best, all this claim appears to be covering is the format of the information generated at the source i.e. the Web site from which the web document is This has little to do with alternate display formats of bookmarked Web documents as set up at the receiving computer display. In addition, there is still no suggestion in Li of a predetermined display interface format which is alternate to a standard or default interface format used in the receiving Web station display.

The Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 9, 1, and 15-20, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Reed et al. in view of Li, further in view of Yohanan is Respectfully Traversed.

Claims 2, 4, 9, 11, and 15-20 are submitted to patentable for all of the reasons set forth above for independent claims 1 and 8. In addition these claims set forth that a bookmarked Web document may be a hyperlinked web document in another Web document. For purposes of expediting the present prosecution, Applicants will concede that bookmarked Web documents which are hyperlinked are equivalent to book-marked non-hyperlinked Web documents. However, these claims still remain patentable for all of the reasons set forth hereinabove for independent claims 1 and 8.

It should be noted that the Examiner may have inadvertently included independent claim 15 in this secondary group. Claim 15 does not include a bookmarked hyperlinked document.

In view of the forgoing, it is submitted that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 19,226

(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Thomas E. Tyson IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054 IBM Corporation 11400 Burnet Road Austin, Texas 78758